

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: **Boecker et al.**

Serial No.: 10/631,065

Filed: **July 31, 2003**

For: **Device Address Locking to Facilitate
Optimum Usage of the Industry Standard
IIC Bus**

§ Group Art Unit: **2181**

§

§ Examiner: **Franklin, Richard B.**

§

§ Attorney Docket No.: **AUS920030466US1**

§

§

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

35525
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE
CUSTOMER NUMBER

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION

Sir:

No fees are believed to be required. If, however, any fees are required, I authorize the Commissioner to charge these fees which may be required to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447. No extension of time is believed to be necessary. If, however, an extension of time is required, the extension is requested, and I authorize the Commissioner to charge any fees for this extension to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447.

In response to the Final Office Action of May 24, 2006, please amend the above-identified application as follows:

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing of claims which begins on page 2 of this paper.

Remarks/Arguments begin on page 5 of this paper.

Amendments to the Claims:

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application:

Listing of Claims:

1. (Previously presented): A method for performing bus arbitration, the method comprising:
receiving, by a device driver layer from at least one application included in an application layer, a request to perform a device access operation on an end device on a bus, the device driver layer including at least one device driver that communicates with the end device utilizing the bus;
determining, by the device driver layer, whether the end device is locked; and
responsive to the end device not being locked, locking, by the device driver layer, the end device and performing the device access operation.
2. (Original): The method of claim 1, wherein the device access operation is one of a read operation and a write operation.
3. (Original): The method of claim 1, further comprising:
responsive to the end device being locked, denying the device access operation.
4. (Original): The method of claim 1, wherein the step of determining whether the end device is locked includes determining whether an address of the end device is found in a list of occupied end devices.
5. (Original): The method of claim 1, wherein the step of locking the end device includes placing a device address of the end device in a list of occupied end devices.
6. (Original): The method of claim 5, further comprising:
responsive to the device access operation completing, unlocking the end device.
7. (Original): The method of claim 6, wherein the step of unlocking the end device includes removing the device address from the list of occupied end devices.

8. - 14. (Canceled).

15. (Previously presented): An apparatus for performing bus arbitration, the apparatus comprising:
a bus;
at least one end device connected to the bus;
at least one application included in an application layer; and
a driver layer that includes a wrapper layer, the driver layer including at least one device driver
that communicates with the at least one end device utilizing the bus,

wherein the wrapper layer receives a request from the at least one application to perform a device
access operation on the at least one end device from within the at least one end device on the bus,
determines whether the at least one end device is locked, and, responsive to the at least one end device not
being locked, locks the at least one end device and performs the device access operation.

16. (Previously presented): A computer program product, in a computer readable medium, for
performing bus arbitration, the computer program product comprising:

instructions for receiving, by a device driver layer from at least one application included in an
application layer, a request to perform a device access operation on an end device on a bus, the device
driver layer including at least one device driver that communicates with the end device utilizing the bus;
instructions for determining, by the device driver layer, whether the end device is locked; and
instructions, responsive to the end device not being locked, for locking, by the device driver
layer, the end device and performing the device access operation.

17. (Original): The computer program product of claim 16, wherein the instructions for determining
whether the end device is locked include instructions for determining whether an address of the end
device is found in a list of occupied end devices.

18. (Original): The computer program product of claim 16, wherein the instructions for locking the
end device include instructions for placing a device address of the end device in a list of occupied end
devices.

19. (Original): The computer program product of claim 18, further comprising:
instructions, responsive to the device access operation completing, for unlocking the end device.

20. (Original): The computer program product of claim 19, wherein the instructions for unlocking the end device include instructions for removing the device address from the list of occupied end devices.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. With this amendment, claims 8-14 have been canceled.

I. Interview

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended during the interview that was held on July 18, 2006.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 101: Claims 8-14

The Examiner has rejected claims 8-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed towards non-statutory subject matter. Claims 8-14 have been canceled; therefore this rejection is believed to be overcome and should be withdrawn.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph: Claims 8-14

The Examiner has rejected claims 8-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 8-14 have been canceled; therefore this rejection is believed to be overcome and should be withdrawn.

IV. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that this response is proper for entry because it removes issues for appeal and that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejections have been overcome.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: July 24, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/Lisa L.B. Yociss/

Lisa L.B. Yociss
Reg. No. 36,975
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants